

FEB 26 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Advisory Action mailed January 18, 2007. A Request for Continued Examination is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Advisory Action mailed January 18, 2007, Claims 1-8 and 10-14 were pending in the Application. In the Final Office Action, Claims 1, 2, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Martin, Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105, hereinafter Martin). Claims 3-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of De Boor et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,204, hereinafter De Boor). Claims 10 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Buckham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,016, hereinafter Buckham). Claims 11 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Boor in view of Buckham. In the Advisory Action, it was stated that the request for reconsideration has been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance.

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends claims 1-8 and 10-11, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-8 and 10-14. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is being added to these claims. Reconsideration of the claims in light of the following arguments is respectfully requested.

III. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2 and 12-14 were rejected under U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Martin, Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105).

Claim 1

Martin discloses a method and system for providing resource access in a mobile environment. A central content server is able to return requested content to requestors in a

format suitable for their device, such a mobile devices. (col. 2, lines 34-36 and 41-42). Martin discloses a *plurality of links* to available services but does not specifically disclose how these links are determined. (col. 3, lines 33-34). Martin further discloses a *list of hyperlinks*. In Fig. 3B, the list includes nine items, each item represents a category of content, such as "Finance," "News/sports," and "Travel." (col. 9, lines 16-19). These hyperlinks are desired or frequently visited sites, for example. (col. 8, lines 19-20).

Claim 1 is an independent claim and has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, claim 1 requires *parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more Web content data items in the Web page and displaying to the mobile device one or more link indications that correspond to the one or more Web content data items*, each link indication providing a link to a service through a wireless connection from the mobile device, and each service performing a service related to a type of Web content data item.

Data detection is provided to parse through the Web page and create new links to further improve accessibility for mobile users. (Spec., p. 8, lines 16-18). Web content data items are data, such as a telephone number, an address and an email address identified within the Web page. For example, the content of the Webpage is searched to identify telephone numbers (Spec., p. 17, lines 1-2). The content of the Webpage is parsed to identify addresses (Spec., p. 17, lines 16-17). An email address for a company or individual listed in the Web page is identified for contacting (Spec., p. 17, lines 27-29).

New links, or the one or more link indications, are provided for these Web content data items. These new links provide a service from the mobile device through a wireless connection. For example, telephone number links are provided to the mobile device display, and the telephone number links may be accessed to dial the listed number. As another example, new links to addresses are provided to the display allowing addresses to be accessed along with a map for locating the address for the user's convenience. As a further example, new links to email addresses are provided to the display. When accessed these email links allow the user to send an email to the displayed email address. (Spec., p. 8, lines 20-24, 26-30; p. 9, lines 1-2).

It was stated in the Office Action that Martin teaches that the user searched the predetermined links for the desired service in the current content of the webpage. A search of predetermined links displayed to a webpage is different than parsing a webpage for Web content

data items, such as a telephone number, then displaying links that correspond to the Web content data items. More specifically, Martin does not teach *parsing* the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more *Web content data items in the Web page* and *displaying* to the mobile device *one or more link indications that correspond to the one or more Web content data items*, each link indication providing a link to a service through a wireless connection from the mobile device, and each service performing a service related to a type of Web content data item, as required by claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 and 12-14

Claim 2 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. Claims 2 and 12-14 each depend from claim 1 and are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2 and 12-14 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

IV. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Jr., et al., in view of De Boor, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,204).

Claims 3-5 and 7

Claims 3-5 and 7 have been amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein. These claims are otherwise not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3-5 and 7 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right.

Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 10 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Jr., et al., in view of Buckham, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,016).

Claim 10

Buckham is relied on for the teaching enabling a map to be provided on a mobile resource showing a location for the identified address. Buckham discloses providing graphical location information for mobile resources using a data-enabled network. Such resource locations include the *location of an individual, a car, truck or other vehicle* using a PDA or wireless telephone. Applications that maintain use of such location information are fleet management applications or applications for providing driving directions. (col. 1, lines 14-24).

Claim 10 is an independent claim and has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, claim 10 requires displaying to the mobile device by the online map service the location of the street address on an online map if the user selects the link indication to activate the link. The comments provided above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Displaying to a map the location of a resource such as an individual, car, truck, or other vehicle using a PDA or wireless telephone as disclosed in Buckham is not the same as displaying a *street address* on an online map. Thus, Buckham does not disclose displaying to the mobile device by the online map service the location of the street address on an online map if the user selects the link indication to activate the link, as required by claim 10. For at least this reason and for similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 6

The comments provided above with respect to claim 10 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claim 6 has been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit

that claim 6, as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Boor in view of Buckham.

Claim 11

De Boor discloses a wireless communication device with markup language based man-machine interface. De Boor discloses that a phone book object stores records of names, associated *telephone numbers, addresses, email addresses*, etc. on a web browser 107, separate from the wireless communication device 100. (Fig. 1 and col. 13, lines 28-30).

Claim 11 is an independent claim and has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, claim 11 requires *parsing the currently accessed Web page* dynamically in real time to identify one or more Web content data items in the Web page and if one of the one or more Web content data items comprises an email address, then displaying to the mobile device a link indication that corresponds to the email address. The telephone numbers *stored* on Web browser as disclosed in De Boor is not the same as telephone numbers *parsed* from the currently accessed Web page, as required by claim 11.

Buckham discloses a browser application 146 on a client platform that runs a java applet that may be used to send message to mobile resources, and trigger location based events such as generating an email or other message when a mobile resource traverses a specified boundary or when the mobile resource receives a specified signal. (col. 8, lines 54-47; col. 9, lines 7-12). A client platform 140 may be associated with a mobile device 130 and a computing unit 142, or may be remotely located from the mobile device. (Fig. 1, numerals 130, 140 and 142; col. 8, lines 23-26).

As amended, claim 11 requires initiating an email to the email address *by the mobile device* using the email service if the user selects the link indication to activate the link. In regard to Buckham, the comments provided above with respect to claim 10 are hereby incorporated by reference. Buckham discloses that the java applet of the client platform 140, not the mobile resource, initiates an email. Although a mobile resource may be associated with the client platform because it happens to be located nearby the client platform, the client platform monitors

the locations of the mobile resources and initiates an email based on when a mobile resource traverses a specified boundary or when the mobile resource receives a specified signal. Initiating of an email by a client platform after monitoring mobile resources is different than initiating an email by the mobile device, as required by claim 1.

Thus, neither Buckham nor De Boor discloses parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more Web content data items in the Web page; if one of the one or more Web content data items comprises an email address, then displaying to the mobile device a link indication that corresponds to the email address; and initiating an email to the email address by the mobile device using the email service if the user selects the link indication to activate the link. For at least these reasons and for similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 8

The comments provided above with respect to claim 11 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claim 8 has been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6, as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if she can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for the time to respond up to and including February 26, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 26, 2007

By: Julie Daniels Missud
Julie Daniels Missud
Reg. No. 51,330

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910